

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated March 29, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 29, 2004. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-35 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1 and 27-35 are rejected and claims 2-26 and 32 are objected to by the Examiner. Claims 27-35 have been cancelled by Applicant. Reconsideration of rejected claim 1 and objected claims 2-26, is requested for reasons presented below.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 12, 14, 20, 25 and 26 are amended to clarify the invention. Claim 23 is amended to correct a minor typographical error. These amendments are not presented to distinguish a reference, thus, the claims as amended are entitled to a full range of equivalents if not previously amended to distinguish a reference.

Claim 32 is objected to. With respect to claim 32, the Examiner states that the phrase "said source pump" lacks antecedent basis. Applicant has cancelled claim 32. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 35 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner asserts that claim 1 does not clearly describe what is meant by the term "precise" and how it is intended to limit the claim. Additionally, the Examiner asserts that Applicant does not clearly describe what is meant by the phrase "selectable combination". Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 1 as amended. Applicant has deleted the terms "precise" and "selectable combination" and amended claim 1 to clarify the invention. Furthermore, Applicant has cancelled claim 35. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Porter* (U.S. 3,887,110). Applicant has cancelled claim 27. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 28-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Porter* (U.S. 3,887,110). Applicant has cancelled claims 28-34. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Burrell, et al.* (U.S. 3,602,033) and *Chevallet, et al.* (U.S. 5,342,527). Applicant has cancelled claim 35. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner asserts that claim 1 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and that claims 2-26 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Consistent with the Examiner's assertion, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1 has been amended as described above to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and that claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)